

23rd March 1922] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

to the hookworm disease and I find the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government has also spoken of this disease. I think the hon. Member Mr. Richards said that 98 per cent of the people of this province are infected with this hookworm. This is an alarming statement. (Laughter.) He went further on to say that the result of the infection, if unchecked, would be the destruction of the man-power of India. Sir, if 98 per cent of the people of this province are infected by this disease, I think it might very well be that 50 per cent of the hon. Members of this House are also infected (laughter). Therefore, Sir, I should like to have some information on that point, on what authority Mr. Richards has made that statement. If his statement is well supported by evidence, I should like to know what steps the Sanitary Department have taken or are intending to take in order to eradicate this pest."

Mr. F. J. RICHARDS :—"I had hoped to be able to place on the table of this House two pamphlets which would answer fully the questions asked by my hon. Friend. The pamphlets are in the press, but unfortunately I could not get them in time. I think probably to-morrow I can place the pamphlets in his hands and the hands of other members of the House. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in answering in detail his question at the present moment. It is rather a long story."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I wish only to make a few observations before I withdraw this motion. The hon. Mr. Richards as well as the Minister for Local Self-Government referred to the hookworm disease. I think the question of hookworm disease is an imperial matter, and if so, the Central Institute at the headquarters should, strictly speaking, look to this matter and further, from what has been said it appears that there is nothing more to be done in the matter. All that can be known is known and what remains to be done is only to popularise the information that we have already got, and for that I do not think why we should have a provision of Rs. 15,000 under that item. It is not a small sum at all and I would only refer to the hon. the Revenue Member who considered that even Rs. 25 was a very big sum for him and ask whether Rs. 15,000 which is many times over Rs. 25 is not a big sum. If it can be saved, it has to be saved. As regards the other points, I do not think it has been seriously disputed that while we are not able to spend much money upon schemes, we are spending on establishment more than what is necessary. However, I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 27.20 lakhs under Demand XVIII—Public Health and Vital Statistics was put and carried.

The grant was made.

#### DEMAND XIX—AGRICULTURE.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I beg to move for a grant not exceeding a sum of Rs. 14.82 lakhs under Demand XIX—Agriculture.

[23rd March 1922]

*Motions 579 to 581.*

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

579. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for Personal Assistant to the Director of Agriculture.*

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

580. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for Personal Assistant to the Director.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

581. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for additional assistant to the Director.*

*Motion 582.*

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

582. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,600 for additional assistant to the Director.*

“ I move, Sir, this motion only to elicit information as to what are the qualifications and duties of the additional assistant to the Director.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ Sir, the additional assistant's place is perhaps better described as a statistical assistant's place. The question was raised last year, Sir, and this House was pleased to sanction the appointment. On that occasion, I brought to the notice of the House that the information prepared by this officer was demanded by the Cotton Committee and the Board of Agriculture, and I also pointed out the various advantages accruing to the Government and to the country from the preparation of these statistics. In addition to these bodies, the Cotton Committee and the Board of Agriculture, two other bodies of a responsible kind, have also recommended the preparation of these statistics, after the above debate took place in this House. The Sugar Committee and the Industrial Committee have also recommended an intensified preparation of statistical information. Sir, the duty of examining statistics by tahsildars hitherto undertaken by the Board of Revenue is now transferred to the Agricultural department. Orders are in the course of being issued in this matter. This was originally agreed upon in G.O. No. 2290, dated 13th October 1919, but it was held in abeyance with a view to consider the question of the simplification of the karnam's accounts. Such simplification is found impossible and all the work of statistics done by the Board of Revenue will have to be hereafter undertaken by the Board of Agriculture, that is, by the special officer. The preparation of the weekly season report should also be undertaken by the Director of Agriculture, as also the return of retail prices. At present 6 crops are being forecasted ; in all 18 periodical forecasts relating to paddy and industrial crops are submitted by the karnams, revenue inspectors and tahsildars. There is also a demand for statistics of the main food crops, such as ragi, cholam, cumbu, varagu, Italian millet and samai. There is also a difficult problem of the estimates of outturn of mixed crops.

“ The advantages of these crop forecasts and statistics can never be over-estimated. They give us an idea of our food supplies and will enable us to prepare ourselves against famine or scarcity conditions. They also assist the producer and the trader in this country in fixing prices especially



23rd March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

in the case of forward contracts. To be forewarned is always to be forearmed and the statistics are useful as indicating to the ryot, to the merchant and even to the foreign trader and manufacturer, to Government and public men, the barometer of production which so largely guides the barometer of prices. These statistics are thus useful to the country as well as to the Government.

“The question is also, to some extent, of international importance. The international character of the trade in sugar and cotton is well known. India can no longer remain in isolation. The trade in and the prices of her industrial crops are determined by the world markets and accurate statistics are all the more necessary to steady her markets. Information as to the total quantity and value of agricultural produce and the average annual income of the agricultural classes from year to year is useful as showing where we stand and what the essentials are for the country's further progress. It is to statistics that we must turn in order to obtain answers to several questions which are of vital importance to the country. The following are some such questions:—

(1) The pressure of population on the soil and the question of an approaching insufficiency of food supply, a problem which very often threatens our country, as already mentioned.

(2) The replacement of extensive by intensive cultivation.

(3) Changes in the economics of agriculture and changes in agricultural conditions due to changes in prices and wages of labour and other causes.

(4) Variations in livestock and their sufficiency or otherwise.

(5) The proportion of breeding to young stock and how this is affected by the spread of cultivation as giving an index to our supply of milk, wool, skin, meat, etc.

“The factors of statistical importance are (1) production, (2) consumption, (3) amount in stock and (4) prices. Their future inter-relation at any moment has to be judged from their inter-relation in the past. Another use of price statistics is to show the changes in the purchasing power of money and this is essential if the economic phenomena of different countries or at different periods are to be compared. This is done by the use of index numbers. Again, the comparison of wages and prices shows the improvement in the economic condition of the people which is the vital concern of every civilized Government.

“Sir, all this work is being attended to by this one officer who is assisted by a very small staff. Last year I brought to the notice of the House what agencies America employs in preparing this statistical information. There is considerable demand for our forecasts even as they are. The Tuticorin Cotton Merchants' Association and several cotton traders in Bombay are constantly asking for our reports and the last mentioned are urging for more frequent reports on cotton. The Agricultural Department is also publishing returns every week of the cotton received at mills and pressed and these returns are sent to 104 companies or individuals interested in cotton. The value of these statistics has been repeatedly acknowledged by the trade. All this work has to be done by the Statistical Assistant.

“I have to say only one word more, Sir. In a letter, dated 2nd March 1922, the Secretary to the Indian Central Cotton Committee has observed as

[Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu] [23rd March 1922]

follows about the Madras forecast: 'I believe Madras is considerably ahead of several other provinces in the accuracy of the figures.'

"I have submitted how these figures are necessary and it is impossible that these figures could be prepared except with the help of a specialist. I may also bring to the notice of this House, Sir, that this specialist Mr. Viswanatha Rao has been asked for by the Government of India for their statistical work and the Director of Agriculture found it impossible to spare his services and in order not to stand in his way was prepared to recommend him for a higher salary. We have got a very able officer and the figures furnished by him are more accurate than those in any other province and I think it will be a great disservice to the country if this appointment is taken away."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I should like to have one small information. I think the hon. the Minister said that this was a portion of the work hitherto done by the Board of Revenue. So, is this a new appointment?"

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"It is not a new appointment."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"May I know whether, in consequence of the reduction of the work of the Board of Revenue, there has been any reduction in the establishment of the Board? This is a very relevant inquiry. I do not wish to discuss the international importance of these statistics."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"Whether my hon. Friend wishes to discuss the international importance of these statistics or not, no Government can claim to be civilized if it does not prepare statistics. As for the question with which my hon. Friend is more interested, viz., whether there was any reduction in the establishment of the Board of Revenue, I may tell him that the establishments hitherto doing this work will be transferred to this work under the additional assistant."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

*Motion 583.*

5 p.m.

The following motion was not made:—

Mr. B. MWUNISAMI NAYUDU:—

583. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,000 for additional assistant to the Director.*

*Motion 584.*

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

584. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance to personal assistant.*

"Sir, it does not need many words to commend this motion to the House. We are bound to support the wishes of this House, that as far as possible all the duty allowances which are now being given should be abolished. With these few words, I move this proposition."

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—"Sir, I have given notice of a similar motion. I think that the duty allowances given to the various officers



23rd March 1922] [Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi]

should be abolished. The Members of the House have expressed themselves in no uncertain terms regarding the omission of these duty allowances. We find that duty allowance is provided for the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture at the rate of Rs. 100 a month. We, at first, understood that the Government intended these duty allowances only as a temporary measure intended to remedy some adverse circumstances which are of a temporary character. But they are continuing these duty allowances always. It seems to me that no good case has been made out to allow these duty allowances. The Government must go into the whole question, as recommended by the Salaries Committee and see whether these allowances can be merged in salaries or dispensed with. I therefore press for deletion."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" Sir, so far as these duty allowances are concerned, it seems to me that the House is more or less determined to take them away. In fact, in one or two previous cases they have been done away with already. Whether the cause is the same as mentioned by my hon. Friend, I may say that I do not wish to go against the wishes of the House. There is only one matter which I must, however, bring to the notice of the House, namely, that while they accepted to omit, or rather have taken away the duty allowances of some officers in the city of Madras, they have not taken away similar allowances in the case of others. Of course, if it were left to me, I should have said that in the city of Madras where these officers live, the cost of living is higher than in the mufassal, and the house-rent alone covers a large portion of the allowance that we are giving. Anyhow as the House is of opinion, and as it appears to me the whole House is anxious, that these allowances should be taken away, I do not wish to oppose this motion. But, Sir, if finally it turns out that some officers in the city of Madras are allowed and others are not allowed this duty allowance, we may have to come before the House with an additional application or a supplementary demand for grant, so that there may be some consistency of procedure in this matter. For the present, I am prepared to accept the motion of my hon. Friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Sir, in supporting this motion, I beg to state for the information of the House that we, the members of this House made a serious mistake. There were some motions for the omission of duty allowances, and some were voted against, under the head 'Land Revenue.' Then we thought that the matter ended in a compromise by the hon. the Revenue Member consenting to deduct Rs. 5,00,000 from the total grant under that head, and that all the items of duty allowances allowed to the deputy collectors lent to the various departments would go under that head. So when we discussed other items in the budget, there was no opposition about these duty allowances, or anybody getting them. But later on, it is stated that all the deputy collectors who were lent to other departments like General Administration, etc., were not affected. If that is so, the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests and the personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration are the only unfortunate men who are to suffer by the resolution carried by the House. If the general opinion expressed in this House of omitting all duty allowances is not to be given effect to by the Government, but only the particular duty allowances voted against will be cut out, I think we will either have to cut out all the duty allowances or give back the duty allowances specifically voted

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu]

[23rd March 1922]

against. In fact, there is no reason why a number of officers in the Presidency town, for instance the Assistant Secretary of the Finance Department, temporary Additional Secretary, Revenue Under Secretary, Development Under Secretary, Under Secretary of the Law Department and Assistant Secretary to the Board of Revenue, should get the duty allowances; and only the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests and the personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration should lose their duty allowances? If that is so, we shall have to deduct all the duty allowances, or allow the hon. the Home Member to bring in a supplementary demand for grant in the case of these two officers of the Presidency town. In regard to the officers of the mufassal, my opinion, as also the sense of the House, is, that the duty allowances should be disallowed for all officers of all classes."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I also gave notice of a similar motion. I thought, Sir, that after the hon. the Minister has agreed to take away this duty allowance, the motion might be withdrawn so that it might be utilised by the department in other ways. Whatever that may be, a grave position has been raised, namely, that because an understanding was practically come to that all duty allowances should go away, we thought we need not press the motions for omissions of duty allowances in some departments. The only difference we thought was that in non-votable items which affect civilian officers they might not be bound by the decisions of this Council, and the two civilian officers that spoke on that subject would not take the responsibility of cutting short the duty allowances which are non-votable. So far as the votable items of duty allowances were concerned, I think a few motions were pressed and voted upon in some cases, and in the e cases they were carried by a large majority. Therefore, in any case, a kind of understanding was come to, and some cases of duty allowances were not taken up, as it was thought that it was left to the Executive officers of the departments to similarly cut them off. Our opinion was not that any one or two of these duty allowances should go so far as votable officers are concerned. I am sure that some of us would bring a resolution so that it would also be possible to cut down the duty allowances in non-votable cases also, as we believe that it would be considered invidious that some officers should draw duty allowances while others do not, that highly paid officers should receive the allowance while officers on lower pay are not allowed to draw it. I think that all officers who are now receiving duty allowances should continue to do so, unless we are able to decide that no one should receive it at all. So I would request the House to consider the position before disposing of this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, as I was specifically referred to by my hon. Friend Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu, I think I ought to make my position somewhat clear in regard to these duty allowances. It was urged by him, if I understood him aright, that because I agreed to a lump deduction of Rs. 5 lakhs from the total grant which I had asked on behalf of my department, and as the Council had already voted against the duty allowances in respect of one particular set of unfortunate officers, therefore there was a sort of understanding in his own mind that I was going to effect a similar stoppage of duty allowances in the case of other officers about whom motions had been tabled but either were not discussed, or if discussed were not pressed. May I remind the hon. Member that the reduction of Rs. 5 lakhs which was of course discussed and



23rd March 1922] [Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

voted upon by this House was the last item in the agenda of that day. All the motions which related to the elimination of duty allowances in regard to a variety of heads which were embraced in my grant had been previously before the House; some of them, as I said, were not pressed, and some of them discussed and withdrawn. It was only in regard to the Indian settlement officers and the assistant settlement officers that I complained that the Council had shown their wrath in the extreme. I tried to save them from that wrath but I found myself helpless. I was able to understand the attitude of the House by reason of the fact that Settlement officers and Survey officers have unfortunately been criticised rather adversely in this House more often than once. There was, I submit, no sort of undertaking between myself and the House as regards the duty allowances which were neither discussed nor pressed. The only duty allowance which was discussed and carried by the House was the duty allowance relating to the Settlement Department. To that extent, I confess I will take the sense of the House into consideration. But that I should extend the same action in regard to departments where duty allowances have not been withdrawn by the vote of the House, I do not think, Sir, would be in any way a correct position to adopt. Nor is it indeed correct to infer that I agreed definitely, when the final vote for the reduction of Rs. 5 lakhs was passed, to extend a similar process of elimination of duty allowances wherever the words 'duty allowance' occurred in the whole budget grant relating to the department. I just wish to clear that misapprehension."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"As I also have been referred to, I think, Sir, it is incumbent on me to say a few words in order to bring out clearly, as I understand it, the position which has now arisen. Hon. Members or some of them have realized the fact that the effect of their resolutions will be to penalise one individual or two individuals out of many who are practically in an identical position. I refer to those officers who are on the cadre of the Deputy Collectors and hold selective appointments in the city of Madras. I will not take it any further—to any wider area—as I understand that is the point taken. It had special relation to an officer in whom I have particular interest, the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests. I did my utmost to prevent the Council from carrying a motion depriving that deserving officer of a duty allowance, but I was unsuccessful. I had to send word to him that I much regretted the decision of the Council which I thought involved an injustice to him, but that as the resolution had been carried, I saw no means of evading the force of it and must therefore give him the alternative of resigning his present appointment and going back to the regular line or continuing to serve in Madras without the allowance on the assurance of which he originally accepted the appointment. The Chief Conservator and I shall be very sorry indeed if as a consequence of the resolution of this House and the pressure of his domestic circumstances, he replies 'I cannot afford to serve any longer in the appointment I now hold, and must ask to be relieved of it and posted to some other appointment in the regular line'. I told him that if he elected the latter alternative, I would do my utmost to see that he was not deprived of any portion of his duty allowance until he had been actually relieved by the Revenue Department, which I would request to make immediate arrangements for the purpose. That, Sir, is the position which has arisen. Some of the hon. Members of this House have been struck by the anomalies which arise out

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[23rd March 1922]

of their action in reducing duty allowances in some cases and not pressing or withdrawing motions for the reduction of duty allowances in other cases. My hon. Colleague Mr. Habib-ul-lah has pointed out that there was no understanding that he should make similar reductions in all cases. His repudiation of that suggestion is quite in consonance with my recollection of what took place.

“ Personally I should be very glad indeed if some decision could be arrived at which would have the effect of remedying what I personally regard as an injustice to the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator of Forests. I say nothing about other officers such as the personal assistant in the Registration Department. Now it is one thing to say that what is considered to be an injustice should be remedied, and it is quite another thing to say exactly how that result can be achieved. But if there really is a general feeling that it is desirable to remedy what I look upon as an injustice and what hon. Members may regard as something less serious but still worthy of being remedied, I would suggest that perhaps the best method of bringing out the sense of the House in the matter is by forcing a division on this motion, it being understood that a substantial majority in favour of the retention of the duty allowance in this case is at least some indication of the sense of the House that something should be done to remedy the action previously taken. I merely suggest this course. I have actually received a personal representation signed by, I think, 12 members of this House who voted in favour of striking off the duty allowance of the personal assistant of the Chief Conservator. The purport of it is that they would be glad to have the matter settled otherwise if the effect of that note is to create an anomaly directly prejudicing one officer out of several. The Government cannot act on any representation received from 10 or 11 members of the House. But if the House should signify in any way by a substantial majority that it sympathises with the view taken by these 10 or 11 members, the Government would be ready to consider whether there are any means of giving effect to that desire.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, the statement of the hon. the Home Member has come upon me as a surprise, especially that portion of it that he received a representation from 12 members of this House for a reconsideration of the votes which have already been given. So far as I am concerned, I will say this: this question of duty allowance was under discussion last year and also this year. It was discussed in connexion with the first of these demands, Land Revenue. It was again discussed in connexion with civil justice for district and sessions judges, I do not say that there was any distinct understanding between the Revenue Member and the House; but I did understand that the House has, in these two or three motions, given sufficient indication of their desire in regard to cutting down the duty allowances of the officers in the provincial service. I did not understand the House in any other manner except this. If now the Home Member says that there is no understanding, that the Government will not take it as indicating the wishes of the House—”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ May I rise to say that I never suggested or intended to suggest anything of the sort. The position is that whereas the sense of the House as originally indicated was in favour of cutting down duty allowances and whereas now a section of the House is



23rd March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

desirous of making a modification in particular cases, what I wish to ascertain is whether that section is an important section covering a majority of the House or not."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I very much fear that the House has been for the last 15 minutes engaged in a discussion somewhat irrelevant and opposed to the standing orders. When Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu said that there was some misapprehension, I thought I might as well allow that to be cleared up. But the thing has turned out to be something more than a mere misapprehension. What evidently some hon. Members are troubled about is that in some cases the House has voted omission of the duty allowance, and in other cases it has not. They now come forward and say that the action of the House has produced an anomaly. But how that general question of anomaly is relevant to this motion whether the duty allowance to the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture should or should not be omitted, I confess I do not see. In view of the statement that the Home Member has made that by some process of voting upon this particular motion we could take the sense of the House with regard to the general question of duty allowances, I feel bound at once to warn hon. Members that that cannot be done. Whatever some hon. Members may or may not have in their minds, what they will now vote upon is the question of the duty allowance, proposed to be omitted, in the case of the personal assistant to the Director of Agriculture."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"There is no question of voting necessary, as I am prepared to accept the motion, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The voting is nevertheless necessary."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—"I may be permitted to withdraw it, Sir" (Cries of 'No, no.')

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Let me finish. That is the situation as I have explained. My impression is this. The House was of opinion in some cases that the duty allowance should go, and in other cases that it should not go. When the question of misapprehension was first raised, I hardly thought that it would take this turn. Votes are taken on definite principles. Every motion is read out, is discussed, and is finally voted upon unless withdrawn. And if after all the trouble that I have been taking to make things as clear as I can, if hon. Members at the end of a few days rise up and say that they have been under a misapprehension, either I must be wanting in clearness or the hon. Members must be wanting in an adequate understanding of things. That is what it comes to. So far as I am concerned, let hon. Members clearly understand that the votes already taken cannot be gone back upon. In regard to subsequent motions, hon. Members may vote as they please. But a vote upon one motion cannot in any case be taken to be equivalent to a vote upon any other motion, or all motions put together, much less could it be taken to mean a reversal of a vote or votes already taken. The position is very clear, and I would beg hon. Members to understand the issues clearly and avoid further misapprehension in regard to them. I may also add that if hon. Members on the non-official benches feel that certain duty allowances had been passed by a misapprehension it is open to them to bring up a consideration of those allowances by way of resolution.

[The President]

[23rd March 1922]

If the Government feel that a perfectly clear vote of the House must be reversed, it is properly open to them to bring forward a supplementary demand at a later stage."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I wish to be quite clear, Sir. I am doubtful if it is open to the Government to bring forward any such supplementary grant. If I do not mistake the rules, there are great difficulties in the way."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I do not say I have examined the rules. I only mention it in passing. Were not certain travelling allowances cut down, and did not the hon. the Home Member reserve to himself the right to bring forward a demand for a supplementary grant at a later stage with regard to those allowances?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I venture to say, Sir, that I spoke of allotments for travelling allowances which stand altogether on a different footing? A duty allowance when cut out goes for good. But when a portion of an allotment for travelling allowance is cut out, the balance remains and can be utilized for perhaps two-thirds of the year."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"There is probably nothing sacrosanct about these things. A duty allowance goes when it is omitted; and if it is put back, it comes. But I cannot permit a vote upon the motion now before the House to be taken to indicate the wish of the House in regard to any general question. Also I feel that I must refer to the incident which the hon. the Home Member has mentioned. Certain hon. Members have evidently written to him privately stating that they had been under a misapprehension in regard to certain votes taken in the House in which they had participated. While of course it is perfectly open to any hon. Member to write to the Government, explaining his position in any case, I must point out that the proceedings of this House are public; the share which hon. Members take in them is also public. I do not think the House could now cognize any statement like that made behind its back. I do not presume to blame any hon. Member for having written what he has. But so far as the House is concerned, I feel bound to rule that the House is not called upon to take note of such a thing."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, by way of personal explanation, I should like to say that the representation which I referred to was presented to me this afternoon at 3 o'clock, and that I had had no previous intimation or anything of that sort. And so far as I am personally concerned, I am quite prepared to place it in your hands at once. I was consulted on the question whether I could suggest any means of enabling the signatories to give effect to a change which they personally desired. My answer was that it was essential to ascertain whether the change that they desired was desired by the House as a whole; and if that could be ascertained by any means then it might be possible for Government to meet their wishes. I do not wish for one moment to take advantage of this motion as a means of going back upon any previous decision of this House. But I am responsible for suggesting one method of elucidating what as a fact are the wishes of this House. You, Sir, have just ruled any such procedure to be out of order. But I must emphasize that my only object was to ascertain the wishes of the House in the matter."



23rd March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" With reference to what the hon. Member has said, I would say that I have not questioned the hon. Home Member's intentions."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I looked on it as an inference not from what you said, Sir, but from what has been said by certain hon. Members in the course of the discussion. I should like to take this opportunity to explain that it was my intention to prevent any inference being drawn that Government are seeking to force the House to a reconsideration."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As for the paper that is proposed to be placed in my hands, all I would say is that I take no interest in it. I will leave it where it is."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" I press the motion, Sir."

The motion was put and declared carried.

Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu demanded a poll, but again just before the commencement of the poll, said that he did not want it, on which the hon. the President observed: "An application for poll once made cannot ordinarily be withdrawn."

A poll was then taken with the following result :—

*Ayes.*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayananingar.      | 27. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu.         |
| 2. " Rao Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu. | 28. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.                         |
| 3. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.      | 29. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.              |
| 4. Mr. E. Periyannayagam.                 | 30. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu.           |
| 5. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar.        | 31. " M. Krishnan Nayar.                                |
| 6. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.            | 32. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.                   |
| 7. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.              | 33. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhachari.                   |
| 8. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur.  | 34. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.                |
| 9. Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu.         | 35. Mr. K. V. Ramachari.                                |
| 10. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.              | 36. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.                        |
| 11. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.    | 37. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.                         |
| 12. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu.          | 38. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.                          |
| 13. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.   | 39. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.                       |
| 14. Sir P. Tyagaraya Chettiyar.           | 40. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.              |
| 15. Mr. S. I. Shanmukham Pillai.          | 41. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.                          |
| 16. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.     | 42. Rao Sahib E. C. M. Masoorenhas.                     |
| 17. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.          | 43. Mr. A. T. Palmer.                                   |
| 18. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.       | 44. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.                          |
| 19. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.              | 45. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi.           | 46. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.          |
| 21. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.              | 47. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya.                       |
| 22. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Punja.         |   |
| 23. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar.   |   |
| 24. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar.         |   |
| 25. Mr. A. Subbarayudu.                   |   |
| 26. Dr. P. Subbarayan.                    |   |

*Noes.*

1. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar.

| 2. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar.

[23rd March 1922]

*Neutral.*

- |                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson. | 7. Mr. R. Littlehailes.           |
| 2. „ Sir Charles Todhunter.      | 8. Mr. P. T. Rajan.               |
| 3. „ Khan Bahadur Muhammad       | 9. Mr. F. J. Richards.            |
| Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.      | 10. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.   |
| 4. „ Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.  | 11. Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 5. Mr. T. E. Moir.               | 12. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari.   |
| 6. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.          |                                   |

The motion was carried, 47 voting *for*, 2 *against* and 12 remaining *neutral*.

*Motion 585.*

The following motion was not then made :—

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

585. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for duty allowance to personal assistant.*

The Council then adjourned at 5-35 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday the 24th day of March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
*Secretary to the Legislative Council.*

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்  
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS